UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/828,628	04/05/2001	Ylian Saint-Hilaire	10559/425001/P10439	5525

20985 7590 08/10/2005

FISH & RICHARDSON, PC
12390 EL CAMINO REAL
SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2081

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, THANH T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2144	

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/828,628	SAINT-HILAIRE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tammy T. Nguyen	2144	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *(3)* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 January 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12, 16-26 and 31-42* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12, 16-26, and 31-42* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *05 April 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Detailed Office Action

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed January 14, 2005.

2. Claims 13-15, 27-30 are cancelled.

3. Claims 31-42 are newly added.

4. Claims **1-12, 16-26** are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-12, 16-26, and 31-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rudy et al., (hereinafter Rudy) U.S. Patent No. 6,360,252 in view of Petkovic et al., (hereinafter Petkovic) U.S. Patent No. 6,185,527.

7. As to claim 1, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, including a method comprising: preparing, at a first unit in a source device, first information to be transmitted to a destination across network link wherein the resource device comprise a mobile device, and wherein the destination comprises a home network (see fig. 4) (see col.7, lines 14-22); separately preparing, at a second processing unit in the source device separate from the first processing unit, second information to be transmitted to the destination, (see col.7, lines 14-22); and preparing, at a stream processing unit in the source device, a data stream comprising the first and the second information to be transmitted across the network link (see col.27, lines 34-46, and col.28, lines 49-63). But Rudy does not explicitly teach a pre-determined reliability. However, Petkovic teaches a pre-determined reliability (see col.8, line 65 to col.9, line 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Petkovic into the computer system of Rudy to have a pre-determined reliability because it would have provided an efficient system that satisfies the need for arrangement in advance.

8. As to claim 2, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising aggregating first and second information sent from applications into the data stream (see 7, lines 14-22).

9. As to claim 3, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, in which preparing the information includes framing the first information (see 7, lines 14-22).

10. As to claim 4, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, in which preparing the other information includes framing the second information (see 7, lines 14-22).

11. As to claim 5, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, in which preparing the first information includes processing the information according transmission requirement of the source device (Fig.3).

12. As to claim 6, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, in which preparing the first information includes processing the first information according to a transmission requirement of the network link (Fig.17).

13. As to claim 7, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, in which preparing the second information includes processing the second information according to a transmission requirement of the source device (fig.3).

14. As to claim 8, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, in which preparing the second information includes processing the second information according to a transmission requirement of the network link (Fig.17).

15. As to claim 11, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising, at a destination-side of the network link, removing the preparations from the first information (see col.22, lines 35-44).

16. As to claim 12, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising, at a destination-side of the network link, removing the preparations from the second information (see col.7, lines 15-22).

17. As to claim 16, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, including an article comprising: a machine-readable medium which stores machine-executable instructions, the instructions causing a machine to: preparing, at a first unit in a source device, first information to be transmitted to a destination across network link wherein the resource device comprise a mobile device, and wherein the destination comprises a home network (see fig. 4) (see col.7, lines 14-22); separately preparing, at a second processing unit in the source device separate from the first processing unit, second information to be transmitted to the destination, (see col.7, lines 14-22); and preparing, at a stream processing unit in the source device, a data stream comprising the first and the second information to be transmitted across the network link (see col.27, lines 34-46, and col.28, lines 49-63). But Rudy does not explicitly teach a pre-determined reliability. However, Petkovic teaches a pre-determined reliability (see col.8, line 65 to col.9, line 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Petkovic into the computer system of Rudy to have a pre-determined reliability because it would have provided an efficient system that satisfies the need for arrangement in advance.

18. As to claim 17, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, in which preparing the first information includes framing the first information (see 7, lines 14-22).

19. As to claim 18, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, in which preparing the second information includes framing the second information (see 7, lines 14-22).

20. As to claim 19, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, in which preparing the first information according to information includes processing first information according to a transmission requirement of the source device (fig.3).

21. As to claim 20, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, in which preparing the first information includes processing the first information according to a transmission requirement of the network link (fig.17).

22. As to claim 21, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, in which preparing the second information includes processing the second information according a transmission requirement of the source device (Fig.17).

23. As to claim 22, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, in which preparing the second information includes processing the second information according to a transmission requirement of the network link (fig.17).

24. As to claim 23, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, including a system comprising: first mechanism located at a first side of a network link and configured to prepare first information included stream information that requires reliable transmission from a source transmission across the network link, wherein the source comprises a mobile device, wherein the destination comprises a home network, wherein the reliability transmission comprises a reliability requirement (see fig. 4) (see col.7, lines 14-22); separately prepare second information included in the stream that does not require reliable transmission to the destination for transmission across the network link (see col.7, lines 14-22); and prepare the stream for transmission across the network link and a second mechanism located at a second side of the

network and configured to: handle preparations made to the stream at the first side in order to prepare the first information and the second information included in the stream for delivery to the (see col.27, lines 34-46, and col.28, lines 49-63). But Rudy does not explicitly teach a pre-determined reliability. However, Petkovic teaches a pre-determined reliability (see col.8, line 65 to col.9, line 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Petkovic into the computer system of Rudy to have a pre-determined reliability because it would have provided an efficient system that satisfies the need for arrangement in advance.

25. As to claim 24, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, in which preparing the first information and the other information includes framing the first information and the other information (see 7, lines 14-22).

26. As to claim 25, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, in which preparing the first information and the second information includes processing the information and the other information according to a transmission requirement of the source (Fig.17).

27. As to claim 26, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, in which preparing the first information and the second information includes processing the first information and the second information according to a transmission requirement of the network link (Fig.13).

28. As to claim 31, Gross teaches the invention as claimed, including an article comprising: a machine o readable medium which stores machine executable instructions, the instruction causing a machine to; processing reliable information is

configured to require a reliability requirement for transmission (see col.7, lines 14-22); processing unreliable information; frame the unreliable information (see col.7, lines 14-21); and processing the reliable information and unreliable information to be sent on a stream of information (see col.27, lines 34-46, and col.28, lines 49-63), wherein the unreliable information is configured for a reduced processing requirement than a processing requirement for the reliable information (see col.21, lines 54-67). But Rudy does not explicitly teach a pre-determined reliability. However, Petkovic teaches a pre-determined reliability (see col.8, line 65 to col.9, line 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Petkovic into the computer system of Rudy to have a pre-determined reliability because it would have provided an efficient system that satisfies the need for arrangement in advance.

29. As to claim 32, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the unreliable information is configured to not require a reliability requirement for transmission (see col.21, lines 54-67). But Rudy does not explicitly teach a pre-determined reliability. However, Petkovic teaches a pre-determined reliability (see col.8, line 65 to col.9, line 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Petkovic into the computer system of Rudy to have a pre-determined reliability because it would have provided an efficient system that satisfies the need for arrangement in advance.

30. As to claim 33, Gross teaches the invention as claimed, wherein framing the reliable information comprises preparing the reliable information for transmission using a transmission protocol (see col.22, lines 35-44).

31. As to claim 34, Gross teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the unreliable information is configured to use a lower amount of processing resource than the reliable information (fig.17).

32. As to claim 35, Gross teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the processing of the reliable information comprises: maintaining an order of framing (see col.7, lines 14-22); forwarding the unreliable information to an unreliable packet fragmenter (see col.21, lines 54-67; and forwarding frame reliable information and control information associated with the framed reliable information to lower layer processing unit for the unreliable information processing (fig.13).

33. As to claim 36, Gross teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the unreliable information processing comprises: framing the processed unreliable information, control information associated with processed unreliable information, and unreliable packet fragments; and forwarding the framed processed unreliable information, control information associated with the framed reliable information to a master stream processing unit (see col.7, lines 14-22).

34. As to claim 37, Gross teaches the invention as claimed, further comprising instruction causing the machine to: process the stream of information; and send the stream of information to the home network (see fig.13).

35. As to claim 38, Gross teaches the invention as claimed, including an article comprising: a machine readable medium which stores machine executable instruction, the instruction causing a machine to: receive a stream of information comprising reliable information and unreliable information, wherein the reliable information is configured to required reliability requirement for transmission (see col.7, lines 14-22, and col.22, lines 35-44); handle the unreliable information, wherein handling the unreliable information comprises: collecting unreliable information packets; deframing the unreliable information packets and forwarding the unreliable information packets and control information associated with the unreliable information to a first destination in the home network (see fig.13); and handling the reliable information, wherein handling the reliable information comprises: collecting reliable information packets (see col.7, lines 14-22, and col.21, lines 54-67); deframing the reliable information packets and forwarding the reliable information associated with the reliable information to a second destination in the home network (fig. 13). But Rudy does not explicitly teach a pre-determined reliability. However, Petkovic teaches a pre-determined reliability (see col.8, line 65 to col.9, line 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to implement the teachings of Petkovic into the computer system of Rudy to have a pre-determined reliability because it would have provided an efficient system that satisfies the need for arrangement in advance.

36. As to claim 39, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the forwarding of the unreliable information occurs prior to the forwarding of the reliable information (see col.21, lines 54-67).

37. As to claim 40, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the forwarding of the unreliable information occurs prior to the forwarding of the unreliable information (see col.22, lines 35-44).

38. As to claim 41, Rudy teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the handling of the unreliable information is not dependent on the handling of the reliable information (see col.21, lines 35-44, and col.22, lines 54-67).

39. As to claim 42, Gross teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the unreliable information is configured to required a lower amount of handling operations than the reliable information (fig.17).

Conclusion

40. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on

the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

41. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire the examiner should be directed to **Tammy T. Nguyen** who may be reached via telephone at **(571) 272-3929**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. eastern standard time.

If you need to send the Examiner, a facsimile transmission regarding this instant application, please send it to **(703) 872-9306**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, David Wiley, may be reached at **(571) 272-3923**.

TTN
August 4, 2005

MARC D. THOMPSON
MARC THOMPSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER